

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 749

PS 007 932

AUTHOR Goodstein, H. A.; And Others  
TITLE The Prediction of Elementary School Failure Among High Risk Children.  
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Storrs. Dept. of Educational Psychology.  
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Apr 75  
GRANT OEG-0-70-2250 (607)  
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE  
DESCRIPTORS \*Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Comparative Analysis; \*Elementary Education; Intellectual Development; Intelligence Quotient; Intervention; \*Learning Difficulties; \*Longitudinal Studies; Multiple Regression Analysis; \*Predictive Ability (Testing); Predictive Validity; School Holding Power; Social Development; Special Classes  
IDENTIFIERS \*Project Head Start

## ABSTRACT

This report briefly summarizes the educational progress of a sample of children who took part in one of the earliest Head Start programs (1966). The report addresses the following questions: (1) Was participation in Head Start a factor in preventing retention in grade and/or special class placement? (2) Were there differences between Head Start and non-Head Start children on achievement measures upon reaching the sixth grade level? (3) What was the efficiency of a battery of psychoeducational tests administered at the beginning of first grade in prediction of academic achievement in the sixth grade? and (4) Did this battery of tests assist in the discrimination between children who progressed normally through the grades and those who were retained or placed in special classes? Preschool test results (from children exiting Head Start in 1966 and their non-Head Start counterparts) were compared to the results of the Lorge-Thorndike intelligence quotients and the Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) (for the same children in the sixth grade). Results showed that a significantly smaller percentage of Head Start children than non-Head Start children had been placed in special education classes or retained in grade; though there were no significant differences in academic achievement at the sixth grade level. Also demonstrated was the possibility predicting a high percentage of children who will fail to progress as expected in elementary schools; the MRT provided for a large percentage of this potential prediction. (ED)

ED108749

PS 007932

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE PREDICTION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
FAILURE AMONG HIGH RISK CHILDREN\*

A paper selected for presentation  
at the Annual AERA Meeting in  
Washington, D. C. in April, 1975

H. A. Goodstein, Associate Professor  
S. Gwen, Associate Professor  
J. F. Cawley, Professor

Department of Educational Psychology  
School of Education  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

\*The data collection for antecedent variables was supported by contracts with the Office of Economic Opportunity, Proj. No. OEO 1366 (1966) and Proj. No. OEO 4177 (1968).

Support for collection of student achievement data and preparation of this report was provided by a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, USOE, "A Program Project Research & Demonstration Effort in Arithmetic Among the Mentally Handicapped" OEG-0-70-2250(607), #162008, under the direction of J. F. Cawley, Project Director and H. A. Goodstein, Assistant Director, University of Connecticut

The authors wish to acknowledge Mr. G. William Saxton,  
Director of Research, and his excellent staff for their efforts  
in assisting the identification of children from the attendance  
files; Dr. Robert Nearline, Administrator for Funding and Evaluation,  
for making available sixth grade achievement data on the subjects;  
and Mr. Richard Clancy for assisting in the identification of  
children receiving special education services.

H. A. Goodstein

S. Owen

J. F. Cawley

This report represents the third chapter in an evaluation of the Head Start Program for economically disadvantaged children sponsored by the City of Hartford and the Office of Economic Opportunity for the 1965-1966 academic year. Previous evaluation efforts demonstrated that the Head Start Program resulted in significant changes in the psycholinguistic characteristics and learning aptitudes of the preschool children upon their exit from the program (Cawley, 1966). However, when the children were compared to a contrast group at the beginning of first grade, no significant differences were recorded on a battery of psychoeducational tests (Cawley, Burrow, and Goodstein, 1968).

This evaluation will focus upon the status of the academic achievement and the number of retentions in grade or special class placements among the previously identified samples of Head Start and Non-Head Start children who should have been in the sixth grade during the 1972-73 academic year. Specifically, several evaluative questions will be raised:

1. Was participation in Head Start a factor in preventing retention in grade and/or special class placement?
2. Were there differences between children who were enrolled in Head Start and Non-Head Start children on the following measures of general and specific achievement -- Lorge-Thorndike Verbal Intelligence, Lorge-Thorndike Non-Verbal Intelligence, Metropolitan Achievement Test - Reading (recognition and comprehension), and Metropolitan Achievement Test - Arithmetic (computation and reasoning)?
3. What was the efficiency of a battery of psychoeducational tests administered at the beginning of first grade in the prediction of academic achievement in the sixth grade?

4. Did this battery of psychoeducational tests assist in the potential discrimination between children who will maintain normal progress through the grades from children who will be retained in a grade and/or be placed in a special education situation?

#### METHODOLOGY

The original evaluation (Cawley, 1966) included a total of 138 children who were pretested and posttested with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. During the first grade evaluation (Cawley, et al, 1968), 54 of these children were administered the psychoeducational test battery. These children are described as the Primary Head Start (PHS) sample. Some children were absent on scheduled testing days; some children could not be located; and some children were in classroom locations not included in the testing schedule. An additional 77 children who had attended Head Start were systematically selected to provide a Secondary Head Start (SHS) sample who had not been previously tested in preschool. This sample would provide a control for any sensitivity to testing that would have been developed in preschool. A Non-Head Start (NHS) sample was systematically selected to provide for an independent contrast group. This sample numbered 78 children. The total original 1966 sample, the SHS sample, and the NHS sample comprised a master list containing the names of 293 children.

The City of Hartford Board of Education maintains a master file which lists each child in the school system along with the child's birthdate, address, and school. This list also includes children who are attending schools outside the district through programs such as Project Concern (the Hartford regional busing program for integrated education), or because of special education placement. A search of this file yielded 68% of the original sample (198 children) who could be unambiguously identified as still remaining in the Hartford School System.

47 of the children were previously included in the PHS sample. This represented 87% of the original PHS sample. 53 of the children were previously included in the SHS sample. This represents 69% of the original SHS sample. 50 of the children were previously included in the NHS sample. This represented 64% of the original NHS sample. 48 of the children were members of the 1966 Head Start sample that was not tested in 1968. We shall refer to this group as the Head Start Sample Not Previously Followed Up (HSNF): This represented 57% of those children who were not followed up in 1968.

From the master file, it was possible to determine whether the child had been placed in special education, been retained at some point in his educational history, or had been a participant in Project Concern. Special education placement was further checked by the examination of the list of identified children by personnel of the special education department. From the files of the Evaluation Department, test results from the sixth grade achievement testing program were obtained for all children who had maintained adequate progress and were currently enrolled in the sixth grade. The results included Large-Thorndike intelligence quotients (verbal and non-verbal) and Metropolitan Achievement Tests in reading (recognition and comprehension) and arithmetic (computation and reasoning). Children in special education programs, those who had been retained, and those who were Project Concern students did not have sixth grade test results.

## RESULTS

### Analysis of Potential Attrition Biases

Attrition is one of the necessary drawbacks to any longitudinal research or evaluation designs. As was discussed earlier, attrition rates for samples

4

in this study ranged from 13% to 43%, with an overall attrition rate of 32%. It was therefore necessary to perform several post-hoc comparisons among the reduced samples and the original samples on their performance on measures either at preschool or beginning of the first grade. Findings of no differences on such analyses would serve to validate the proposition that differential attrition did not take place among the reduced samples. Additionally, these reduced samples might be shown to essentially demonstrate similar psychoeducational characteristics as their original complete samples.

Table 1 displays the mean scores of the PHS grade six sample, the HSNF grade six sample, and the original preschool sample (of which there are subsamples) on the Stanford-Binet IQ test (pre and post) and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA) (pre and post). No significant differences were found among these means. With the possible exception of the ITPA pre-test means, the reduced sixth grade samples had mean scores on the preschool measures remarkably similar to those achieved by the original sample. One could conclude from this analysis that the PHS sixth grade sample and the HSNF sixth grade sample were not unique portions of the original sample and did not suffer differential attrition.

Table 2 displays the mean scores of the PHS sixth grade sample, the SHS sixth grade sample, and the NHS sixth grade sample on the beginning first grade psychoeducational measures as compared with the scores of the original three samples as they were constituted in 1968. No significant differences were found among the sixth grade reduced samples. This compares with the results recorded in the 1968 evaluation. Additionally, each comparison between a reduced sample and its original counterpart demonstrates no differential attrition. Attrition did not appear to bias the distribution of any of the reduced samples.

TABLE 1

POST-HOC COMPARISONS OF PRIMARY HEAD START, HEAD START NOT FOLLOWED UP, AND  
ORIGINAL PRESCHOOL TOTAL SAMPLE ON PRESCHOOL INTELLIGENCE AND PSYCHOLINGUISTIC MEASURES

|                    | <u>PHS</u> |    | <u>HSNF</u> |    | <u>ORIGINAL SAMPLE</u> |     |
|--------------------|------------|----|-------------|----|------------------------|-----|
|                    | $\bar{x}$  | n  | $\bar{x}$   | n  | $\bar{x}$              | n   |
| ITPA-pretest       | 66.81      | 47 | 65.55       | 44 | 68.03                  | 136 |
| S-B IQ<br>pretest  | 88.46      | 46 | 87.38       | 47 | 88.54                  | 138 |
| ITPA<br>posttest   | 94.54      | 46 | 94.74       | 42 | 94.32                  | 136 |
| S-B IQ<br>posttest | 98.80      | 44 | 93.19       | 42 | 95.89                  | 138 |

TABLE 2

POST-HOC COMPARISONS OF ORIGINAL AND SIXTH GRADE REDUCED SAMPLES ON FIRST GRADE MEASURES

|                          | PHS<br>$\bar{x}$ | SHS<br>$\bar{x}$ | NHS<br>$\bar{x}$ |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>STANFORD-BINET IQ</u> |                  |                  |                  |
| Original Sample          | 94.02 (N=54)     | 91.56 (N=78)     | 93.77 (N=77)     |
| Sixth Gr. Sample         | 93.28 (N=47)     | 92.58 (N=53)     | 94.46 (N=50)     |
| <u>FROSTIG</u>           |                  |                  |                  |
| Original Sample          | 40.50            | 39.59            | 39.75            |
| Sixth Gr. Sample         | 40.09            | 39.13            | 39.58            |
| <u>ITPA</u>              |                  |                  |                  |
| Original Sample          | 126.26           | 122.82           | 126.04           |
| Sixth Gr. Sample         | 124.83           | 123.19           | 125.58           |
| <u>METROPOLITAN</u>      |                  |                  |                  |
| Original Sample          | 38.82            | 33.12            | 35.81            |
| Sixth Gr. Sample         | 35.38            | 32.08            | 35.44            |

The PHS sample forms a pivot for the argument of equivalence between the four reduced sixth grade samples (PHS, SHS, NHS, and HSNF) in regards to antecedent abilities. The PHS sixth grade sample was shown equivalent to the HSNF sample in prekindergarten and equivalent to the SHS and NHS samples at the beginning of first grade. No direct comparison could be made between the HSNF sample and the SHS or NHS samples, since the HSNF sample was not tested at the beginning of first grade and the SHS and NHS samples were not tested at the prekindergarten period.

#### Evaluative Questions

1. Was participation in Head Start a factor in preventing retention in grade and/or special class placement? Analysis of the student roster data files indicated 3 of the 47 children in the PHS sample had been retained in a grade and 1 child had been placed in a special education program. 6 of the 53 children in the SHS sample had been retained in a grade and 4 children had been placed in a special education program. 5 of the 48 children in the HSNF sample had been retained and 3 received special education placement. 11 of the 50 children in the NHS sample had been retained and 5 received special education placement.

When the three Head Start samples are pooled, it can be seen that 9.5% of the Head Start children (14 of 148 children) were retained and 5% (8 of 148) received special class placement. This compares with a retention rate of 22% (11 of 50) and a special education placement rate of 10% (5 of 50) in the Non-Head Start sample.

It might be pointed out that the retention rates cited above are just slightly underestimated. 3 of the children placed in special education

had been retained in grade prior to the decision to place them in special education. Additionally, 2 children had been retained in grade and subsequently passed over one grade level prior to sixth grade. For the purpose of this analysis, these children were treated as being in the non-retained classification.

The special education placements can be broken down as follows: 5 children placed in Intensive Instructional Centers (IIC's); 3 children placed into Opportunity Rooms; 3 children registered in regular classrooms, but attending resource rooms; and 2 children placed in private centers for emotionally and socially maladjusted children. The grade in which retention took place can be further elaborated as follows: 8 children at the pre-primary level; 1 child at kindergarten; 8 children at first grade; 6 children at second grade; 2 children at third grade; 1 child at the fourth grade; and 2 at the fifth grade.

One additional difference in the placement data was noticed. 14% of the Head Start samples (21 children out of 154) were assigned to Project Concern. Only 4% (2 out of 50 children) were assigned to Project Concern from the Non-Head Start sample. Although our samples were not drawn for the purpose of testing differential factors in the assignment of children to Project Concern, it represents a reasonable hypothesis that Head Start participation was a significant factor in a child's involvement in the Project.

2. Are there differences between children who were enrolled in Head Start and Non-Head Start children on achievement measures administered at sixth grade? When the data for the three Head Start samples were compared, a pattern of superior achievement for the HSNF sample emerged (see Table 3). This sample recorded higher scores on the group-administered intelligence scales, performed approximately a grade level higher in reading, and per-

TABLE 3

COMPARISONS BETWEEN SAMPLES ON SIXTH GRADE ACHIEVEMENT MEASURES

|                                  | PHS       |    | SHS       |    | HSNF      |    | Total Head Start Sample |     | NHS       |    |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----------|----|-------------------------|-----|-----------|----|
|                                  | $\bar{x}$ | n  | $\bar{x}$ | n  | $\bar{x}$ | n  | $\bar{x}$               | n   | $\bar{x}$ | n  |
| <u>Large-Thorndike</u>           |           |    |           |    |           |    |                         |     |           |    |
| Verbal IQ                        | 83.00     | 32 | 79.81     | 43 | 88.13     | 36 | 83.21                   | 111 | 86.78     | 31 |
| Non-Verbal IQ                    | 88.22     | 32 | 87.60     | 43 | 90.19     | 36 | 88.55                   | 111 | 89.61     | 31 |
| <u>Metropolitan - Reading</u>    |           |    |           |    |           |    |                         |     |           |    |
| Recognition                      | 4.25      | 31 | 4.08      | 40 | 5.12      | 33 | 4.44                    | 104 | 4.29      | 29 |
| Comprehension                    | 4.18      | 31 | 3.91      | 41 | 5.05      | 33 | 4.33                    | 105 | 4.25      | 30 |
| <u>Metropolitan - Arithmetic</u> |           |    |           |    |           |    |                         |     |           |    |
| Computation                      | 4.89      | 31 | 4.53      | 41 | 5.27      | 34 | 4.86                    | 106 | 5.04      | 30 |
| Reasoning                        | 4.17      | 31 | 3.86      | 40 | 4.50      | 33 | 4.00                    | 104 | 4.09      | 29 |

formed approximately one-half grade level higher in mathematics. The post-hoc analyses had indicated no such superiority on any of the preschool measures of intelligence or psycholinguistic abilities. An analysis of school placement at sixth grade indicated a pattern of school attendance similar to the other samples of children. Thus, the source of this pattern of superior achievement must remain unknown.

When we combine the three Head Start samples (PHS, SHS, and HSE) we find they have a mean verbal IQ of 83.21 and a mean non-verbal IQ of 88.55 (N=101) as opposed to the NHS sample's mean verbal IQ of 86.78 and mean non-verbal IQ of 89.61 (N=31). These differences are not statistically significant. In reading, the Head Start samples had a combined mean of 4.44 in Recognition and 4.32 in Comprehension. The NHS sample had a mean of 4.29 in Recognition and 4.25 in Comprehension. For mathematics achievement, the Head Start samples had a combined mean of 4.86 in Computation and 4.00 in Reasoning. The NHS sample had a mean of 5.04 in Computation and 4.09 in Reasoning. None of these differences could be considered significant.

The sixth grade achievement data did not include scores for children who had been retained. All but 3 of the children placed in special education were also not included in the achievement testing. These scores were simply not available in the context of the chosen sampling methodology. To a certain extent, one could presume that the available achievement scores of the NHS sample overestimate achievement to a greater degree than the combined Head Start samples. That is, the larger percentage of retained or special education children probably would have combined to further depress the NHS scores.

It is important to point out that this combined population of children achieve at approximately two grade levels below average expectation in reading and the reasoning subskill in mathematics (a subskill dependent to a certain extent upon reading) and approximately a grade and a half below expectation

in computational skills. These children (with 5 exceptions) had never been retained or provided special education. These serious lags in skill areas will continue to handicap these children as they enter the junior high school (or middle school) and senior high school grades.

Superior achievement in computation (a skill that often may be rotely acquired) is a typical finding among educationally handicapped populations. It often represents an attempt by the school to substitute easily managed instruction in mathematics for the more difficult careful development of mathematics concepts. In such situations, computational skills outpace achievement in other aspects of mathematics performance.

3. What is the efficiency of a battery of psychoeducational tests administered at the beginning of first grade in the prediction of academic achievement in the sixth grade? To assist in the answer to this question, the three sample tested at the beginning of first grade (PHS, SHS, and NHS) were pooled. 104 children's scores on Stanford-Binet IQ, the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, the Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (an artificially summed total of five subtests), the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, the Metropolitan Readiness Test, and an informal test of letter recognition were considered predictor variables. The four subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test were considered the criterion variables. The resultant intercorrelation matrix is displayed in Table 4.

IQ, ITPA, and Metropolitan scores intercorrelate at reasonably high levels ( $r$ 's of .45, .47, and .56). This would reflect a common general cognitive factor shared by these instruments. Letter recognition, a demonstrated readiness task, correlates with the Metropolitan Readiness Test at .40. The remaining intercorrelations among predictor variables are of low-order. Among the criterion measures, the two reading scores correlate with a coefficient of .83. The correlation between the two mathematics measures is

TABLE 4

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SIX BEGINNING FIRST-GRADE PREDICTOR AND FOUR SIXTH GRADE CRITERION MEASURES

|                                                    | Predictors |     |     |     |     |     | Criterion Measures |     |     |     |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|
|                                                    | 1          | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7                  | 8   | 9   | 10  |
| 1. Stanford-Binet IQ                               | -          | .31 | .22 | .56 | .47 | .30 | .41                | .44 | .34 | .44 |
| 2. Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception |            | -   | .20 | .32 | .38 | .25 | .28                | .30 | .23 | .28 |
| 3. Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude              |            |     | -   | .29 | .20 | .20 | .19                | .17 | .06 | .12 |
| 4. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities     |            |     |     | -   | .45 | .23 | .39                | .42 | .20 | .44 |
| 5. Metropolitan Readiness Test                     |            |     |     |     | -   | .40 | .52                | .55 | .49 | .51 |
| 6. Letter Recognition Test                         |            |     |     |     |     | -   | .35                | .37 | .23 | .26 |
| 7. Metropolitan Reading: Recognition               |            |     |     |     |     |     | -                  | .83 | .56 | .64 |
| 8. Metropolitan Reading: Comprehension             |            |     |     |     |     |     |                    | -   | .56 | .65 |
| 9. Metropolitan Mathematics: Computation           |            |     |     |     |     |     |                    |     | -   | .76 |
| 10. Metropolitan Mathematics: Reasoning            |            |     |     |     |     |     |                    |     |     | -   |

N=104

somewhat lower,  $r = .76$ . There was a stronger relationship between reading behaviors and reasoning ( $r$ 's of .64 and .65) than between reading behaviors and computation ( $r$ 's of .56).

Step-wise, multiple linear regression analysis was employed to determine the correlation of the entire prediction battery with each criterion measure. Table 5 summarizes the results of these four analyses. In predicting recognition, the Metropolitan, IQ, letter recognition, and ITPA were combined statistically to generate a multiple correlation of .58. This represents an accounting for 34% of the variance in scores on the Recognition subtest. In contrast, the Metropolitan alone has an  $r$  of .52 with Recognition, or 27% of the variance. In predicting Comprehension, the same variables combine to generate a multiple correlation of .61, accounting for 37% of variance in Recognition scores. Again, if one were to use only the Metropolitan, its correlation of .55 with Recognition accounts for 30% of the Recognition variance.

In the prediction of Computation scores, the Metropolitan combines with IQ to generate a multiple correlation of .51, accounting for 26% of the dependent variance. If we would elect to use only the Metropolitan, its simple correlation with Computation of .49 would account for 24% of the variance. In the prediction of Reasoning, the Metropolitan, ITPA, and IQ generate a multiple correlation of .58, accounting for 34% of the variance. Again, if the Metropolitan were used alone, its simple correlation with Reasoning of .51 would account for 26% of the variance.

Gains of 7 to 8% of accounted variance in the criterion measures are recorded by using measures of IQ, ITPA total score, and letter recognition in addition to the Metropolitan for the two reading subtests and the Mathematics Reasoning subtest. IQ scores only add 2% to variance accounted for

TABLE 5

## REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR THE PREDICTION OF FOUR CRITERION MEASURES\*

| <u>Recognition</u>                                     |             | <u>Comprehension</u>                                   |             |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <u>Step</u>                                            | <u>Beta</u> | <u>Step</u>                                            | <u>Beta</u> |
| 1. Metropolitan Readiness                              | .351        | 1. Metropolitan Readiness                              | .343        |
| 2. Stanford-Binet IQ                                   | .135        | 2. Stanford-Binet IQ                                   | .156        |
| 3. Letter Recognition                                  | .137        | 3. Letter Recognition                                  | .146        |
| 4. ITPA                                                | .121        | 4. ITPA                                                | .152        |
| Multiple R = .5772<br>Standard Error of Estimate=12.03 |             | Multiple R = .6108<br>Standard Error of Estimate=12.29 |             |
| II. MATHEMATICS                                        |             |                                                        |             |
| <u>Computation</u>                                     |             | <u>Reasoning</u>                                       |             |
| <u>Step</u>                                            | <u>Beta</u> | <u>Step</u>                                            | <u>Beta</u> |
| 1. Metropolitan Readiness                              | .458        | 1. Metropolitan Readiness                              | .349        |
| 2. Stanford-Binet IQ                                   | .100        | 2. ITPA                                                | .181        |
|                                                        |             | 3. Stanford-Binet IQ                                   | .177        |
| Multiple R = .5109<br>Standard Error of Estimate=12.45 |             | Multiple R = .5807<br>Standard Error of Estimate=10.44 |             |

\*Predictors included represent an optimum battery for prediction: addition of other predictors did not significantly improve prediction.

by the Metropolitan on Computation scores. The Metropolitan Readiness Test is a teacher-administered test, as opposed to the Stanford-Binet or ITPA which should be administered by trained examiners. It may be that the additional power of prediction generated by the latter two measures does not counter-balance the additional costs, both economic and social, of administering these two instruments.

It is noted that the Frostig measure did not contribute to prediction of reading or mathematics achievement. Neither was the Detroit score a significant predictor, although the artificial summing of the subtest scores may have been a confounding factor.

4. Can this battery of psychoeducational tests assist in the potential discrimination between children who will maintain normal progress through the grades from children who will be retained in a grade and/or be placed in a special education situation? A discriminant function analysis was performed on the first grade psychoeducational test scores between 30 children who were retained and/or placed in special education and 103 children who had maintained age in grade progress. The mean scores of included variables for the two samples are included in Table 6. The resultant discriminant function correctly predicted 77% of the inadequate progress children (23 of 30) and correctly predicted 68% (70 of 103) of the adequate progress children. Overall, the function predicted 93 of 133 placements, or 70% accuracy.

The largest mean difference between the two samples on any of the predictor measures was by far the Metropolitan Readiness Test. The inadequate progress children achieved barely two-thirds the score achieved by the adequate progress children. Again, practical considerations might indicate singular use of the Metropolitan Readiness Test for screening purposes.

TABLE 6

## SUMMARY OF SAMPLE MEANS FOR THE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

|                                                       | Special Education<br>or Retention<br>N=30 | Average Progress<br>N=103 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Sex (1=male; 2=female)                             | 1.30                                      | 1.43                      |
| 2. Stanford-Binet IQ                                  | 91.59                                     | 93.87                     |
| 3. Detroit: motor speed                               | 23.33                                     | 27.74                     |
| 4. Detroit: auditory memory for<br>related syllables  | 31.89                                     | 33.65                     |
| 5. Detroit: visual attention span<br>for objects      | 29.74                                     | 31.89                     |
| 6. Detroit: memory for designs                        | 8.78                                      | 10.31                     |
| 7. Detroit: auditory memory for<br>related syllables  | 33.22                                     | 35.02                     |
| 8. Frostig Developmental Test of<br>Visual Perception | 36.59                                     | 39.73                     |
| 9. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic<br>Abilities     | 116.48                                    | 125.63                    |
| 10. Metropolitan Readiness Test                       | 25.37                                     | 36.10                     |

### GENERAL DISCUSSION

This report has attempted to summarize the educational progress of a sample of children exposed to one of the earliest Head Start experiences. Much study and evaluation of Head Start has transpired since 1965. We now recognize that Head Start, by itself, is not a panacea for the educational disabilities associated with economic disadvantage. Preschool curriculums have undergone revision and improvement. Follow-through programs have been initiated to consolidate and build upon skills, concepts, and attitudes fostered in preschool. More open patterns of classroom organization and grouping for instruction have been attempted to foster a more developmental educational process.

In this context, this evaluative report is more historical and descriptive in import than directed toward specific decision-making goals. The data reported herein can be used as a baseline by which improvements in the system of compensatory education can be judged. One would hope to predict that a two year deficit in grade level achievement reported for these children would represent a low water mark in the concerted efforts to improve the educational process for economically disadvantaged children.

Examination of the original description of the Hartford Head Start programs contained in the 1966 report reveals a considerable emphasis upon development of appropriate social skills and academic habits and attitudes. To the extent that it can be presumed that such behavior is related to the demonstration of minimal adjustment patterns in regular grades, the original program can be judged moderately successful. A significantly smaller percentage of Head Start children were placed in special education or

retained in grade. It is a necessary presumption that children who find themselves removed from the regular pattern of age to grade promotions, under the present educational system, have failed to maintain appropriate social or academic habits.

The lack of significant differences in academic achievement on standardized measures in the sixth grade between Head Start and Non-Head Start children is consistent with the majority of evaluations of the early Head Start programs. However, it must again be stressed that the early programs were not designed to sustain academic achievement and were often using untested curriculum models and teaching methods. Goals of enhanced academic achievement cannot be anticipated by evaluators without there having been serious efforts to maximize the system to foster and maintain those goals.

We have demonstrated that we can predict a high percentage of children who will fail to progress as expected in the elementary school. Additionally, we have shown that the Metropolitan Readiness Test, a teacher-administered test, provided for a large percentage of the potential prediction. The purpose of predictions is as a screening tool to identify those children who might best profit from early intervention and remediation. However, prediction, even if perfect, does not offer solutions for prevention. Concerted studies should be initiated to test alternative models for amelioration of social or academic problems among the most high-risk children. In this area, our evaluation must necessarily lead to the asking of additional questions rather than presentation of solutions.

#### REFERENCES

Cawley, J. F. An assessment of intelligence, psycholinguistic abilities and learning aptitudes among preschool children. Storrs: University of Connecticut, 1966.

Cawley, J. F., Burrow, W., and Goldstein, H. A. An appraisal of head start participants and non-participants: Expanded considerations on learning disabilities among disadvantaged children. Storrs: University of Connecticut, 1968.